

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

2-5-2020

2-5-2020 Faculty Senate Minutes

Carol Jamison

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes>

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jamison, Carol, "2-5-2020 Faculty Senate Minutes" (2020). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 56.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/56>

This article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate Meeting
Georgia Southern University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes February 5, 2020

Executive Summary: Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. The Senate accepted the minutes of the December 2, 2019 Senate meeting. The Librarian's Report was approved, as were reports from the General Education Core Curriculum Committee, the Undergraduate Committee, and the Graduate Committee.

The Senate brought forward one item of unfinished business concerning an RFI on the Implementation of the Inclusive Excellence Study's Recommendations for Fostering Community on the Armstrong Campus. Based upon feedback, this RFI was moved to a Discussion Item.

The Senate brought forward six new RFIs. Two of these were discussed at the meeting: Effect of Curriculum Changes on Dropping Enrollment and Working Environment Over Break. The other RFIs (available on Share Point) were not discussed.

Other new business included four discussion items: Fostering Community on the Armstrong Campus (previously noted), Graduate Assistant Stipend Changes, White Supremacy on the GSU campuses, and Update on the Honors College Strategic Plan. Details from these discussions can be found in the minutes below.

Carl Reiber (Provost) gave brief comments on behalf of Kyle Marrero (President) who could not be present at the meeting due to University obligations in Atlanta, GA. These comments included an update on the budget timeline; review of The Discovery Center, which will bring 15,000 middle school students to the Armstrong campus and will provide intern opportunities for our students; upcoming Inclusive Excellence events; and the search for a new athletic director. He then gave his own brief report on core curriculum. He informed Senators that changes to the core are coming fast and are as of yet unsettled.

After several brief announcements, the Senate adjourned at 5:50.

MINUTES

Officers: Helen Bland (President), Trish Holt (President-Elect), Carol Jamison (Secretary), Michelle Haberland (Librarian), and Dustin Anderson (Past-President and Parliamentarian)

Senators in Attendance: Leticia McGrath (CAH), Robert Costomiris (CAH), Jeffery Riley (CAH), Michelle Haberland (CAH), James Todesca (CAH), Carol Jamison (CAH), Chris Cartright (CAH), Jack Simmons (CAH), Amanda Konkle (CAH), Solomon K. Smith (CAH), Grant Gearhart (CAH), Heidi Altman (CBSS), Kevin Jennings (CBSS), Nick Holtzman (CBSS), Addie Martindale (CBSS), Nancy McCarley (CBSS), Delores Liston (COE), Nedra Cossa (COE), Patricia Holt (COE), Linda Ann McCall (COE), Lucas Jensen (COE), Justin Montemarano (COSM), Hans-Joerg Schanz (COSM), Jeffery Secrest (COSM), Sungkon Chang (COSM), Traci Ness (COSM), Donna Mullenax (COSM), Jennifer Zettler (COSM), Andrew Hansen (JPHCPH), Dziyana Nazaruk (JPHCPH), Helen Bland (JPHCPH), Barbara Ross (LIB), Kristi Smith (LIB), Lori Gwinett (LIB), Chuck Harter (PCB), Stephanie Sipe (PCB), Lowell Mooney (PCB), Bill Wells (PCB), Maliece Whatley (PCB), David Calamas (PCEC), Rami Haddad (PCEC), Jim Harris (PCEC), Wayne Johnson (PCEC), TimMarie Williams (WCHP), Katrina Embrey (WCHP), Jan Bradshaw (WCHP), Gina Crabb (WCHP), Chris Hanna (WCHP), Susan Hendrix (WCHP)

Alternates in Attendance: Anne Fuller (LIB), Katie Pham (PCB), Elizabeth Barrow (COE), Amanda Glaze (COE), Cliff Padgett (COSM), Melissa Gayan (CAH), Jose de Cruz (CBSS), Patsy Kraeger (CBSS), Feliz Hamza-Lup (PCEC), Paula Tillman (WCHP), Christopher Brown (CBSS)

Senators not in Attendance: Jennifer Kowalewski (CAH), Jorge Suazo (CAH), Tony Morris (CAH), Lisa Abbott (CAH), Finbarr Curtis (CAH), Richard Flynn (CAH), P. Cary Christian (CBSS), Pidi Zhang (CBSS), Barbara King (CBSS), Fayth Parks (COE), Daniel Chapman (COE), Jessica Garner (LIB), Jake Simons (PCB), Mark Hanna (PCB), Bill Yang (PCB), Cheryl Aasheim (PCEC), Chris Kadlec (PCEC), Anoop Desai (PCEC), Hayden Wimmer (PCEC), Li Li (WCHP), Marian Tabi (WCHP), Christy Moore (WCHP), Nancy Remler (COE), Abid Shaikh (COSM), Ionut Emil Iacob (COSM), Cathy MacGowan (COSM), Shijun Zheng (COSM), Yi Lin (COSM), Marshall Ransom (COSM)

Administrators in Attendance: Carl Reiber (Provost and VP for Academic Affairs), Diana Cone (Vice Provost), Chris Curtis (Vice Provost), Donna Brooks (Associate Provost), Melanie Miller (VP for Student Affairs), Scot Lingrell (VP for Enrollment Management), Amy Ballagh (Associate VP for Enrollment Management), John Lester (VP for Marketing & Strategic Communication), Ashley Walker Colquitt (Dean of the Graduate College), Stuart Tedders (Dean, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health), Mohammad Davoud (Dean, AEP College of Engineering and Computing)

Guest in Attendance: Teresa Winterhalter (Ass. Dean, CAH), Francis Desidero, Cassie Morgan, John Kraft, Amber Culpepper, Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs), Katie Twining (Facility Services), Steve Engel (Honors Program)

I. CALL TO ORDER: Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) called the meeting to order at 4:02.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) made a motion to approve the agenda for the December 2nd meeting. The motion was seconded. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES | Dec. 2, 2019 Carol Jamison (CAH), Senate Secretary made a motion to approve the minutes from the December 2nd meeting. The motion was seconded. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

IV. LIBRARIAN'S REPORT | January 24, 2020 Michelle Haberland (CAH), Senate Librarian, made a motion for approval of the Librarian's Report. The motion was seconded. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

A. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee –Bill Wells (PCB)
The committee is reviewing assessment of core courses. There were no questions.
Delivery of the report acts as a motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

B. Undergraduate Committee –Joanne Chopak-Foss (JPHCOPH)
The committee approved course revisions and rolled back three that needed more work.
They also worked to correct some CIM inconsistencies.
Delivery of the report acts as a motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

C. Graduate Committee – Andrew Hansen (JPHCPH)
The Graduate Committee passed several curricular changes for all colleges.
Delivery of the report acts as a motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

V. SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Helen Bland (JPHCPH) reported that the SEC's unfinished business concerned the RFI on the Implementation of the Inclusive Excellence Study's Recommendations for Fostering Community on the Armstrong Campus. This information was passed forward to Faculty Senate Committees – Student Success, Faculty Welfare and Faculty Development. Based upon feedback, this RFI was moved to a Discussion Item (see below). New business addressed a number of RFIs. Helen Bland reminded senators that RFIs are only requests for information. Six of these items came before the Senate at this meeting. She then opened the floor for clarification of any of these items.

NEW BUSINESS

Request for Information – January 2020

A. RFI on Preferred Names Roll Out (Lisa Abbot, CAH)

Discussion: There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

B. RFI on Waitlist Response Time (Donna Mullenax, COSM)

Discussion: There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

C. RFI on 2020 Military Times Best for Vets College Rankings :Georgia Southern Unranked (Grant Gearhart, CAH)

Discussion: There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

D. RFI ON Trashing of Desks in University Hall (Leigh Rich, WCHP)

Discussion: There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

E. RFI on Working Environment Over Break (Donna Mullenax, COSM)

Question: Why are faculty and staff expected to work in cold buildings over break?

Rationale: Certain building have been uncomfortably cold during breaks despite the fact that faculty may need to work in their offices.

Response: from Rob Whitaker (VIP for Business and Finance)

During the winter break, the university is officially closed to the public as well as employees. As a part of our sustainable efforts, the Facilities team sets the temperatures in buildings to a level that will help conserve energy and costs. Where appropriate for the safety of animals, equipment or research efforts the temperatures are adjusted to accommodate those requests. Each December, a reminder is sent to the campus community making them aware of these adjustments. Any requests should be routed through the appropriate Dean and/or Vice President for review and approval.

Discussion: Donna Mullenax (COSM) appreciates the response to this RFI, but she explained that building temperatures dropped as early as December 18 and were still low January 6. Custodial and staff were working in these conditions. She would like clarification as to why a week before and a week after university closing, the temperatures were still excessively cold. Katie Twining (Facility Services) explained that if there are temperature issues, she should be contacted. There could have been an equipment issue. Facility Services try to ensure that rooms are comfortable by January 2nd.

F. RFI on Effect of Curriculum Changes on Dropping Enrollment (Patricia Holt, COE)

Question: Which academic programs, degrees, or majors have been discontinued, temporarily suspended, suspended, deactivated, labeled an imposition, removed, or terminated since consolidation was announced in January 2018?

What was the rationale for each of these decisions?

Which home campus was each of these located on?

Which of these was the action taken towards only one campus and another campus still has the academic program, degree, or major operating?

How many students were matriculating in each of the programs at the time which action was taken?

Rationale: We are currently facing dropping enrollments, especially on the Armstrong campus. In order to turn this around we need to ascertain what is causing the decline. How much, if any of this fall in enrollment may be due to curriculum decisions?

Response: from Carl Reiber (Provost) and Candace Griffith (Associate Provost)

1. The first five programs under the deactivation list were done during the consolidation process.
2. For specific rationales on program discontinuation, we refer the requestor to the department. Generally, the rationale put forward is lack of student demand. The art programs had several duplicated programs carry through during consolidation and have now eliminated redundant degrees/minors and expanded offerings to the Armstrong campus. The WebBSIT has been deactivated but the former Armstrong BIT is being reactivated to replace it. The BSAT is being deactivated because it is moving to a graduate credential (MSAT) per accreditation guidelines.
3. Programs/departments have decided all of these deactivations/terminations.
4. Finally, we do not have enrollment data for each program at the time action was taken; however, the BOR and SACSCOC does not allow us to terminate a program while students are still enrolled without a teach out plan. This is why we deactivate programs first, then terminate once all students have completed their program of studies.

DISCUSSION: Trish Holt (COE) asked for further justification regarding the response to this RFI. Carl Reiber (Provost) explained that rationale for any terminated programs or degrees should be provided and explained. Trish Holt asked if there were reasons other than low enrollment to discontinue a program, degree, or major. Carl Reiber explained that low enrollment would be a factor if evidence showed a trend occurring for multiple years. Sometimes, accreditation changes may be a reason for deactivation of programs. Situations such as this may account for deactivation.

Discussion Items – January 2020

A. DI on Implementation of the Inclusive Excellence Study's Recommendations for Fostering Community on the Armstrong Campus (Bill Dawers, CAH)

Rationale: What are the university's plans for implementation of the Center for Strategic Diversity, Leadership, & Social Innovation's detailed recommendations to address the negative impacts of consolidation on the Armstrong Campus climate? In the report "3 Campuses One Heartbeat," the Center for Strategic Diversity, Leadership, & Social Innovation noted that the Armstrong Campus was rated markedly lower than the Statesboro and Liberty campus in three major categories: 1) satisfaction with the campus climate, 2) the sense of being valued and belonging, and 3) institutional commitment to diversity and inclusion. The study did not find statistically significant differences in the perceptions of the Armstrong Campus by race, ethnicity, gender identity, or LGBTQA identity, but the study does repeatedly link the campus's low scores to the after-effects of consolidation. The relatively low level of attachment to the Armstrong Campus will pose challenges for the entire university if the problems are not addressed. While issues related to consolidation are addressed at many points in the full report, the recommendations are mostly contained in two bulleted passages, quoted below: Recommendation 5: Elevate the Strategic Campus Integration Journey (p. 53) [...] More than factual communication, we feel that these leaders want to be communicated to with dignity and respect both for how things were and what they are becoming. Some leaders, though not all, are angry and grieving the loss of their culture and ways of operating. The biggest mistake occurs when an institution communicates once, or even twice, about a fundamental change and thinks it is done. Instead, it must keep communicating, even repeating things it believes people have heard already, so that those people understand that you mean it and so they know in their hearts that you value them. As they witness you, also listen to them as part of this communication process.

Discussion: Bill Dawers (CAH) referred to the Inclusive Excellence report. He advises that everyone read the full report, not just the executive summary. In this report, Dr. Williams notes that the Statesboro numbers reporting faculty satisfaction are low, but the Armstrong numbers are alarmingly low. Dr. Williams made numerous recommendations in his report. The study found no statistical difference between campuses regarding other aspects (gender, LGBTQ, etc.). The problems for the Armstrong campus are related to the consolidation. There are things that haven't been fully reconciled. Enrollment is down about 20% since consolidation. It feels as if we might be in a downward spiral. This campus isn't as active, engaged, or cohesive as it once was. Bill Dawers then opened up the floor for questions and comments.

Questions: Jack Simmons (CAH) asked if there was a single thing that caused the drop off in enrollment. Bill Dawers (CAH) responded that quality communication might be an issue directed towards the lower enrollment. Our external messaging missed some beats. Things like the lack of sports, administrative disarray, the lessening of attention to military affairs, all contributed to the decline. Carol Jamison (CAH) asked about rebranding and making clear to students and the community that many of the unique aspects of the Armstrong campus are still in place. Bill Dawers (CAH) agreed that branding in the community is an issue for us. The community is very unclear about what the consolidation has meant for us and for the community. Trish Holt (COE) added that the community doesn't understand and is confused about the effects of consolidation on the Armstrong campus. There are rumors about the state's vision for this campus. Clarifying rumors would help. Carol Jamison (CAH) talked about this issue as a community issue that extends beyond currently enrolled students. Chris Cartright (CAH) asked what faculty can or should be doing in the community to change the narrative. Could we write

letters to the editor that report on faculty and campus happenings? The consolidation is perceived as diminishing our offerings rather than increasing the possibilities. Bill Dawers (CAH) noted that with the loss of certain majors and the implementation of a schedule that doesn't work for students, there is a sense that Armstrong doesn't offer what we did before. That sentiment is out there. Only 31% of faculty feel as if they belong, according to Dr. Williams' study. How can we expect those people to establish new narratives? Faculty need a better understanding of where things are going. Did the new Health Profession building lead to more nursing slots? This is one of many details that faculty should be informed about. The things we used to do are difficult as faculty may no longer feel empowered to do those things.

Lack of internal communication hinders our external communication. Scot Lingrell (Enrollment Management) said that this conversation is worthwhile, and the campus needs to heal. There is a lot of activity going on that could be communicated more broadly. What began as a campus morale issue moved to include an enrollment issue. When you have enrollment concerns, it leads to other issues, and the opposite is also true. Dr. Lingrell's office has put together a one-year tactical plan for enrollment for all three campuses. By the end of March, they should have a draft of a Strategic Enrollment Plan that will question and help us identify what about us is important and will attract students. The Strategic Enrollment Plan is putting together a group from each campus so that he can get a sense of what makes each campus special. Strategies have to be approached differently from each campus. The variety of opportunities is exciting to him as an enrollment manager. We haven't done the best job communicating these opportunities, he explained. For instance, adult students need weekend and evening programs, sometimes short term. Some of our campuses are better at delivering this kind of scheduling than others. We hit the nail on the head as far as the significance of the vibrancy of the campus, he stated. It is critical to this campus.

John Lester (Communications and Marketing) agreed. He stated that GSU is spending more money on advertising Armstrong in Atlanta compared to the other GSU campuses. Strategic Marketing Communications is essential. Each campus must be marketed differently. He hears the faculty and is working on branding for each individual campus. His office is also working on improved internal communications.

Bill Dawers (CAH) said that these initiatives sound like the right way to go. Part of the problem is that we are now two years removed from the consolidation. The question is, how do we make up some of that ground? Helen Bland (JPHCPH) asked Dr. Lingrell about the Strategic Enrollment groups on this campus. How can faculty who want to be part of that committee join? He explained that the deans nominated people to be on the committee. He assumed that they would be representative. She then mentioned faculty focus groups on branding. Meetings will be held on WebEx for those who want to participate. Jack Simmons (CAH) said that he is pleased to hear about the marketing campaigns, but the central concern that Bill Dawers raises about a sense of belonging can't be resolved through branding and marketing. Carl Reiber (Provost) then remarked that he appreciates the discussion. Context is critical, he explained. We have had administrative turnover that has affected the situation. How we make up ground is key. Consolidation was challenging for everyone. There were issues with different cultures on different campuses, such as scheduling issues. Each campus is unique and has a unique history. What was formerly working needs to be put back into place. We need to empower faculty. If they feel stifled, they need to come up a level to get their message across. The faculty need to feel as if they own their programs. New programs are being added to encourage enrollment. He can't announce all of these until

they are approved and finalized. He acknowledged that communication has been a problem. John Lester is new to his position, but sees the moving parts. He will help us make up for lost ground. We are working on internal communication to better facilitate information.

Bill Dawers (CAH) stated that he is heartened to hear about these initiatives. However, what was working at Armstrong isn't working now. We need a working group to identify issues (as explained in Dr. Williams' report). Could we have a group that outlines those issues? Helen Bland (JPHCPH) added that she likes this recommendation. Melissa Gayan (CAH) asked about recruitment. She hears a lot about the billboards but wonders about the human presence that we have locally. Scot Lingrell responded that we have a very robust recruitment initiative. It has recently become more personalized because it is targeted to high schools or social media. He is pleased with our recruitment efforts, but we need to differentiate a bit better what is special about each campus.

The discussion of this item then concluded for this meeting, but Helen Bland stated it will be an ongoing discussion.

B. DI on Graduate Assistantship Stipend Changes (Lori Gwinett, LIB)?

Rationale: What is the rationale for moving Graduate Assistant stipend money to Graduate Studies from the departments responsible for the positions? Why were GA advisors not notified of this change prior to hiring GAs for fall? Why has no one communicated these changes to those responsible for overseeing GA positions?

Discussion: Lori Gwinett (LIB) explained that faculty are concerned about the ramifications of the lack of communication regarding the change in graduate funding. She noted that this summer, faculty noticed that graduate assistantships were being handled differently but were not informed why. Rather than relying on rumor, she sought clarity. The flexibility of what we can do with assistantship money is now limited, she explained. Carl Reiber (Provost) responded that GSU was one of the few institutions that allocated GA funding the way we did. The colleges divided up allotted money internally. End of year money varied from year to year and served as a second bucket of funding. This type of GA budgeting led to silo-ism; some departments were competing against others for the funding. Thus, all of the money was pulled to the graduate college to coordinate the assigning of GAs. This method also ensured that leftover money was used for GA funding. The change helped to support more graduate students. The end of the year money has diminished, and as much as possible, has been protected to prevent loss of graduate funding.

Dr. Ashley Walker Colquitt (Dean, Graduate Studies) explained that with the new method of funding, the Graduate College knows what money is available and can move it to positions as needed. Her office communicated to each department. She apologizes if anyone was not given this information. Budget managers would have approved the movement of money to the Graduate College. She consults with deans before allocating money out. This new method affords more flexibility. Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) said it seems that budgeting for GAs has been cut in the 2020-2021 budget. Ashley Walker Colquitt responded that this is possible because we don't have the same amount of end-of-the-year funding. Carl Reiber (Provost) noted that permanent money has been maintained, but the special request money has been affected by budget cuts. The provost's office had extra money from vacant lines. These lines were

cut to meet budget lines. Thus, that money is no longer available. He has tried to hold the Graduate College as harmless as possible during this budget cut. When enrollment flattens out, we will take chunks of money that colleges and departments consult on. That money will be apportioned to colleges for GAs.

C. DI on White Supremacy at Georgia Southern (Chris Cartwright, CAH)

Rationale: Campus leaders need to challenge the racism on campus, especially in light of recent racist events on GSU campuses.

Discussion: Chris Cartright (CAH) has previously submitted an RFI on this issue. He wanted information on where administration stands concerning this issue. His understanding is that our administration is unable to address white supremacy directly itself. However, white supremacy is particularly salient in our region and at this time in the history in our country. He wants to talk through with faculty what would be an appropriate response. Senate feedback will be used to craft, and then submit, a resolution to the Senate at our next meeting. The History department's statement could be used as a template for this resolution. Trish Holt (COE) noted that we have a new VP for Inclusive Excellence who is coming in. She asked if Chris Cartright has talked to him. He replied that this would be a good next step. Chris Cartright explained that he would like to see more action from administration, and this VP fill that role. He further explained that he sees a distinction between what faculty and administrators can do. Andrew Hansen (JPHCOPH) noted that for his college, discussions on this issue are second nature, and it is part of their mission to include cultural competency elements in courses and training. He recommended cultural competency as SOAR sessions for students, and also for both incoming and current faculty. Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) remarked that we have diversity fellows whom she has met. She asked if Chris Cartright has reached out to these fellows in crafting his resolution, as they have expertise. They could give perspective on the language of this resolution. Chris Cartright replied that he has spoken to them and can get more feedback from them. Dustin Anderson (CAH) noted that this is a long-term issue. He asked that we consider this issue at every level, such as hiring. Are we having conversations about the role of diversity and inclusion? Looking at the microscopic level, we could express and engage with this issue more intensively.

Chris Cartright (CAH) noted that feedback indicates there is readiness and confidence to address systemic inequalities. He sees a lot of support in moving forward on these issues. White supremacy as an ideology and white nationalism are different issues that require different responses. We need to pursue both of these issues. He is looking for advice on how we can address both of these things: hiring practices, and also systemic racism and white supremacists who may be recruiting on our campus. Kristi Smith (LIB), who serves on the Faculty Welfare Committee, told the Senate that this committee has discussed the recent *Chronicle of Higher Education* article on the book burning incident. Maybe the new VP of Inclusive Excellence could work with FYE faculty. Also, we are required to do online training such as cybersecurity. Why not require online diversity training? Michelle Haberland (CAH) asked that we consider, as a faculty, the history department's resolution. We need a cultural change. There are faculty members who are addressing these issues, panels are being held about the first 500 African-Americans who came to our campus, and there is another initiative with SGA that would help us create some measure to gauge how effectively we are hiring. The new VP can pull these together under one umbrella to lead us in a direction of making white supremacy less acceptable on this campus.

Carl Reiber (Provost) noted that this body (the Senate) has the power to recommend that all faculty have some diversity training. Heidi Altman (CBSS) said that the idea that white supremacy can be normalized through first amendment protection is bothersome. We should perhaps have training on how to recognize and counter white supremacist ideology. Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) asked that legal might help us distinguish terminology such as white nationalism and supremacy. Trish Holt (COE) agreed that faculty are at the forefront, but should it be only faculty who take training, or everyone who works on campus? Wayne Johnson (CEC) wondered what would happen if students wanted to form a white supremacist group. How would we handle it? Laura Copeland (Legal Affairs) explained that white supremacy is not a legal term. Dustin Anderson (CAH) noted that the student code of conduct would prevent that from happening. Every student organization has to adhere to a code of conduct that they abide by the university's anti-discrimination policy. This body can do something very similar by creating our own policy. John Lester (VP Comm. and Marketing) noted that we have a Diversity and Inclusive Excellence website to announce our efforts. Wayne Johnson (COC) asked if the white supremacist group stipulated that anyone could join, could they then get around our policy? Melanie Miller (Interim VP Student Affairs) noted that this is possible. Laura Copeland (Legal Affairs) clarified that there is a Supreme Court case which states that we are required to make organizations abide by our non-discrimination policy. However, it is possible that if an organization is not discriminating in membership, we cannot discriminate against their ideology.

Chris Cartright (CAH) noted that we need to make sure our distinctions in terminology are made more clear. White nationalism is his biggest concern. He would like to find a way to create a shared culture of anti-racist pedagogy. He does not want to censure students or punish them for expressing their ideas. However, we live in a social reality that extends beyond the university. White nationalism is spreading, and we need to address it so as not to become a white supremacy campus. Dustin Anderson (CAH) explained that if we have a student organization that is espousing white supremacy ideology, then we have an employee who signed off on it because a student organization needs to have a faculty sponsor. We need to ensure that the faculty we have working on our campuses do not espouse those ideas. We are a gatekeeper for these kinds of ideas. Melissa Gayan (CAH) wanted to go on the record to say that it was hard for her to face her students when they asked if the university approved of these ideas. We were left to our own devices in how to deal with these problems. Quick responses such as making a statement are essential. Amanda Glaze (COE) noted that this kind of organization is an undercurrent. They aren't official student organizations. How can we support our students if administration has its hands tied and the situation doesn't fall under by-laws of student organizations? Chris Cartright (CAH) explained that these movements can grow in the dark, while universities wring our hands on these more difficult issues. He then thanked the Senators for their feedback. He will talk to a number of stakeholders before submitting a resolution.

D. DI on Update on Honors College Strategic Plan (Michelle Haberland, CAH)

Rationale: The Honors Council would like to provide an update to the Faculty Senate about the development of the proposal to transition the University Honors Program into an Honors College.

Discussion: Michelle Haberland (CAH) is on the Honors Council. Members of this Council wanted to provide an opportunity for Senators to ask questions about the transition to a Honors College. She then gave background on the proposal for this change. This is an opportunity for us to enhance enrollment. It will give us a higher profile to recruit high achieving students. Dustin Anderson (CAH) asked if there

was anything in the timeline that we could do to help facilitate this process. Carl Reiber (Provost) noted that this is an excellent, successful program. He was surprised that our Honors Program wasn't a college when he arrived at GSU. The promise is that they will see growth and will make requests for budgets like any other unit. There will be some internal restructuring. Budgeting has been thought through. Steve Engel (Directors, Honors Program) noted that some internal restructuring will occur pending core changes. The goal is to involve students to help create an intensive honors experience.

VI. PRESIDENT'S REPORT –

Carl Reiber (VPAA) reported for Kyle Marrero (President) who could not be present. He first announced the hiring of a new VP of Inclusive Excellence, Dr. TaJuan Wilson . He then noted that the legislative session has begun. The governor's budget has been presented and will be carefully launched to see if there are any changes. Next, he stated that The Discovery Center is being reviewed at USG. It will bring 15,000 middle school students to the Armstrong campus and will provide intern opportunities for our students. Inclusive Excellence events are now listed on the GSU website. He asks that if something is organized in this arena, Senators should ensure that it is broadcast on this website. He then reported on a senior level search for an athletic director. Student affairs has a position open (VP), and announcements to come to open forums will be coming soon.

VII. PROVOST'S REPORT

Carl Reiber (VPAA) noted that core changes are coming fast, so it is difficult to report any definitive information. When he knows more, he will report it to us.

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) noted that we have a third of faculty members who are new to the Senate and anyone of them could be nominated for president-elect in 2020-2021, then president for academic year 2021-2022. We have hired an administrative specialist for the Senate, her name is Y'Lonne Hodges. Dr. Haberland (CAH) reminded Senators that election committee votes are coming very soon. When nominated for a committee, Senators should look at their schedules to ensure that they can meet at the allotted committee times

IX. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The Senate adjourned at 5:50.

**Respectfully submitted,
Dr. Carol Jamison (CAH)**